

## **Remarks**

Applicant's respectfully request entry of this amendment. The following are applicant's response to issues raised in the Office Action.

### **Specification Objection:**

The specification was objected to due to a labeling error. The error has been corrected along the lines of the examiner's suggestion. Withdrawal of the specification objection is respectfully requested.

### **Claim Objection:**

Claim 21 was objected to. Accordingly, claim 21 has been amended. Withdrawal of the claim objection is respectfully requested.

### **Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112:**

Claims 13-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite. Claim 13 has been amended to more clearly recite the claimed invention. Withdrawal of the section 112 rejection is respectfully requested.

### **Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103:**

Claims 1-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being unpatentable over Sakamoto (US 5,420,553) and under 35 U.S.C 103 as being unpatentable over Sakamoto (US 5,420,553) and Koga (JP 2000124068).

Sakamoto discloses a Noise Filter. Koga discloses a Laminated Type Noise Filter.

Neither Sakamoto nor Koga teach, disclose or suggest, as in amended independent claims 1, 7 and 13, a filter that includes a ground plane having a length that is less than the distance between a first and second terminal portion and a width that is less than the distance between the third and fourth portion such that the ground plane does not overlap the first, second, third or fourth portions.

In regards to the 102 rejection, Sakamoto does not teach having first, second and third dielectric layers. Figures 11 and 12 show a monolithic structure, not a layered structure. Since, the cited reference does not show each and every feature of the claimed invention, it is respectfully requested that the 102 rejection be withdrawn.

In regards to the 103 rejection, Sakamoto does not teach, disclose or suggest a ground plane having a width that is less than the distance between the third and fourth portion such that the ground plane does not overlap the first, second, third or fourth portions.

In regards to the 103 rejection, Koga does not teach, disclose or suggest a ground plane having a width that is less than the distance between the third and fourth portion such that the ground plane does not overlap the first, second, third or fourth portions.

The examiner states that Koga does not show the first and second terminals wrapped around the side surfaces. Applicants agree with this conclusion. Further, there is no suggestion in Koga to perform such a modification to wrap the terminals around the side surfaces.

Since Koga does not show or suggest, the first and second terminals wrapped around the side surfaces as recited in independent claims 1, 7 and 13, claims, Applicants submit that claims 1-22 are allowable.

The dependent claims depend from allowable independent claims and add additional patentable features and are allowable therewith. For example, claim 19 recites the ground plane being located between the second and third layers. None of the cited references show a ground plane located between the second and third layers.

Sakamoto does not disclose any layers. Koga discloses a ground electrode located on two of six layers.

**Conclusion:**

In view of the current amendments and remarks, the claims are now believed to be in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Kevin Redmond  
Reg. No. 27,049